Editorial: Thirteenth Special Issue for the ISPIM

Tidd, J.; Huizingh, Koos; Conn, S.

Published in:
International Journal of Innovation Management

DOI:
10.1142/S1363919615020016

International Journal of Innovation Management
Vol. 19, No. 3 (June 2015) 1502001 (2 pages)

DOI: 10.1142/S1363919615020016

Imperial College Press
www.icpress.co.uk

EDITORIAL: THIRTEENTH SPECIAL ISSUE FOR THE ISPIM

JOE TIDD, EELKO HUIZINGH and STEFFEN CONN

Published 6 May 2015

Welcome to the thirteenth special issue of the IJIM for ISPIM. This draws upon papers presented at two ISPIM events in 2014: the Asia-Pacific Innovation Forum, Singapore, and Americas Innovation Forum, Montreal, Canada. From this pool of almost 200 papers 10 were invited for formal peer review by the IJIM, and the eight papers published in this issue are the results of review and revision.

The first three papers continue interest in business model innovation. Amshoff *et al.* present a methodology for pattern-based business model design simplifying development and analysis of business models for disruptive technologies, and validate this with several industrial projects. Bhardwaj, Agrawal and Tyagi explore the innovation options in oncology clinical development, and find that different companies are focusing on standalone interventions (exploratory innovation) and combination therapy (exploitative innovation) in clinical development. They examine the role of capability, scientific networks & market access in the choice of strategic priorities. Krech, Rüther and Gassmann study the different business models of patent aggregating companies, and in particular how patent holders can use patent aggregating companies as means to capture value from their inventions. Drawing upon data over a five-year period and interviews they identify four groups of patent aggregating companies based on the values provided to the original patent holders: guarders; shielders; funders; and earners.

The next four papers explore the internal and external sources and flows of knowledge. Tahmooresnejad and Beaudry evaluate whether an increase in government funding for academic scientists enhances the performance of researchers in both scientific publications and academic patents in the field of nanotechnology. Their analysis reveals a strong relationship between funding and publication productivity, as well as the citation impact of publications, and a strong influence

on the number of patents and the citation impact of patenting activities. Seidle examines the influence of different forms of learning throughout the process of technological innovation. Using interview and archival data from eleven innovation projects in biopharmaceuticals and medical devices, he provides evidence of three distinct learning sequences: (1) intensive-externalising; (2) intensive-internalising; and (3) expansive-internalising. The sequences vary both in the breadth of learning forms utilised and in the degree to which resultant knowledge is internalised as subsequent innovations are pursued. Capdevila applies a multi-level perspective to analyse the crucial role of individuals and communities outside firms in the localised dynamics of innovation, and argues that co-working spaces act as intermediaries between creative individuals ("the underground") and innovative firms ("the upperground"), contributing to the interaction between co-located actors through the articulation of places, spaces, projects and events. Olander and Hurmelinna–Laukkanen examine how and why perceptions of severity and management of risks related to knowledge leaving and knowledge leaking differ across organisational levels and different firm locations. They argue that managers should direct their attention to different control or commitment-enhancing practices to address the risk of harmful knowledge loss and imitation.

In the final paper, Tanev *et al.* introduce the concept of the Lean Global Start-up (LGS) for new technology start-ups facing the challenges of business development, innovation and early internationalisation. Their research with six firms identifies two different paths: lean-to-global (L2G start-ups) and lean-and-global (L&G start-ups).